

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

January 15, 1957

Letter No. 399

Let's Put America's Interest First!

Statement before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on the pending Middle East Resolution by Merwin K. Hart, President, National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York 1. January 15, 1957.

WE of the National Economic Council agree entirely that Soviet Russia's scheme has always been and still is to conquer the whole world—including the United States. But we believe, too, that that part of American foreign policy, that has led America to intervene in the affairs of the whole world, has been one of the greatest factors in promoting this Soviet ambition.

We welcome any forehanded action by the Congress or the Executive to stop the advance of communism. The grave question here is—how effective would the Administration's proposed Resolution be if adopted, and to what extent would American interests be compromised and hampered by it?

The Resolution is directed "against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism." It says nothing about other aggression, such as that of Israel against her Arab neighbors which has often been condemned by the UN.

The Resolution authorizes military and financial assistance against any communist aggression. The experience of the last 20 years suggests that such assistance might become well-nigh unlimited. For Arab diplomats have pointed out that the only deterrent to Israeli imperialist ambition is the fear of Russia. Therefore if the United States neutralizes Russia in the Middle East, this to the Arabs would mean giving Israel the green light to attack her

neighbors and extend her domain from Suez to the Euphrates. Since our Federal debt is already more than twice that of all other nations combined, and our Federal spending is without doubt proportionately as great as our debt, it is highly in the interest of the people of America that the Congress take no steps like those proposed if, as we believe, any other course is open.

We note, too, that there is no time limit on the very great abdication of Congressional power that the Resolution asks, since the Resolution is to expire "when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise."

That is very vague indeed. If any resolution is to be passed there should be a definite time limit.

Incidentally, this is another case where vast powers are asked by the Executive on the ground of a "crisis." Secretary Dulles told this Committee on January 7 it must act fast. All that has a familiar ring. But during the years beginning in 1948, it was not thought necessary to act fast to relieve the problem of the Arab refugees, whose sad plight is largely responsible for any crisis that exists today.

We think, too, that our Government is placing entirely too much reliance on the UN. The UN

has never done anything for the United States and we feel certain it never will. We cannot forget that such men as Alger Hiss were a large factor in organizing the UN. The United States, which pays roughly one third of all the cost, has only a single vote in the General Assembly, while Soviet Russia has three, not including her satellites. We can be outvoted in the General Assembly on any vital issue at any time. No other great nation places anywhere near the confidence in the UN that the United States does.

The language of this Resolution is so interlaced with references to the UN that by adopting it the Congress might be tying this nation into commitments that we will discover only when it is too late—after we have become irrevocably a very minor segment of a world government.

The American Government insisted on viewing the Korean war as a United Nations war. Yet 90 per cent of the "UN troops" were Americans—and practically all the financial cost was borne by America. And after we had thrown away 30,000 American lives, other nations wouldn't let us win it. And so North Korea, along with China, were lost to communism.

This is probably the greatest disaster the UN has brought to the United States and to the world—so far.

* * * *

BUT if this Resolution were adopted, the chief cause of dissension in the Middle East would still remain, utterly unaffected by anything authorized by this Resolution. For many of the Arab nations would continue as before to be a breeding ground for communism.

This of course is because of the bitterness among the roughly 40 million Arabs over the injustice of the driving out of Palestine in 1948 of more than 700,000 Palestinian Arabs, most of whom are still living in squalor on a pittance of some nine cents per day tossed to them through the UN.

The Arabs—and I have talked with many of them in various countries of the Middle East—resent the physical and mental harm done their fellow Arabs of Palestine, and even more the

affront to all Arab peoples. They also fear the ambitions of the Israelis, some of whose champions have boasted that they are going to set up a world power. And they know the Israelis have refused to follow any decisions of the UN that the Israelis did not like, as when they refused to carry out the provision to internationalize Jerusalem.

And while the Arabs know that Zionism is a world movement, they remember that the partition of Palestine was effected in 1947 by the United Nations in New York, under the prodding of the then President Truman. So they naturally hold America particularly responsible for their plight.

Over a period of a century or more, largely because of such American philanthropic activities as the American University at Beirut, Americans built up a tremendous amount of good will not only among the 40 million Arabs but among the roughly 300 million Moslems. All this good will has been, to say the least, greatly undermined by the United States backing of the synthetic State of Israel—a venture in which the vast majority of the American people have not the slightest interest, and to which such co-religionists of the Zionists as the American Council for Judaism are bitterly opposed.

American Zionists have two allegiances, that to the United States and that to Israel. In fact, their allegiance to Israel seems clearly greater than to the United States; for they are willing to wreak grave injury to the United States by building up the State of Israel. And by founding this State and building it up, they have converted the Arabs into enemies. The Arabs, most of whom are Moslems with a passionate belief in God, would never have listened to the blandishments of communism had it not been for these activities of American Zionists, which have opened the door to communism in the Middle East. If it had not been for this activity, America and the western world would not be so threatened by communism in the Middle East. But this American-made threat is what has led to the President's Resolution, now before this Committee.

There is reason to believe there is a powerful bloc in the State Department that is constantly working for Zionist objectives. Mr. Don Lohbeck, whose biography of General Patrick J. Hurley was

published January 8 of this year, speaks several times of this bloc and its power. This bloc has long carried on pro-Israel propaganda not only throughout the country, but right here in Congress. And many Zionists, both in and out of the State Department, have not hesitated to use threat and intimidation to advance their objectives.

Russia, both under the Czars and the Soviets, has long had its eyes on the Middle East. It has wanted a warm water port. It has long sought to cut the British line of communications to the Orient. And it has wanted to participate in the development of Africa.

Yet so long as America, with its own heavy stake in the Middle East, maintained the good will of the Arabs, the Arabs greatly preferred American good will to that of the Soviets. And this Arab good will was a strong factor in keeping back Soviet infiltration and aggression in the Middle East.

But, as I have said, the new American policy of building up Israel has undermined American relations with the Arabs and opened the door to Soviet aggression.

Yet I do not believe that this undermining is irreparable. From conversations with many Arabs both in the Middle East and in America, I believe there is one measure we can take that will be far more effective than this pending Resolution.

It is vital that the Congress place the interests of America first, unhindered by the promptings of any propaganda group in this country that is trying to serve another country.

Let the Congress cut off all aid, both governmental and private—to Israel. Israel would then cease to be a factor. The Arabs, in my opinion, would cease to be interested in communism. War, which could become a third World War, in which we Americans would lose even if we won, would cease to be a serious threat. What Americans want to send their sons to fight for Israel? The lives of perhaps millions of Americans might be sacrificed in such a war. And, incidentally, the great property interests of Americans, which promise such benefits to all the people of the Middle East, might be destroyed.

If this Congress permits continued vast aid to Israel, public and private (and it already has amounted to nearly a billion and a half), then America will be guaranteeing herself a war.

And even rich America, over-extended as she is, is in no condition to fight a third World War.

* * * *

PRIZE ESSAY

On October 15, 1956, the Council announced an Essay Prize Contest based on Council Letter 393.

We take pleasure in printing below the essay by Fred A. Karsten, a fourth year medical student of Wisconsin, who was awarded the first prize of \$200.

Truth For Americans

BY FRED A. KARSTEN

A few years ago, a group of state representatives met in a church in Virginia to discuss the most recent threat to states' rights. These men considered the increasing demands placed upon them by the government to be so depressing to the individual families of the state that some action must be taken. It had been agreed that the meeting and discussion would proceed in a conservative and respectful manner.

For three days, this small convention followed the pattern of tranquility to the point where, like so many meetings of its kind, it barely interested the participants. Then, a 39-year-old lawyer arose to request the floor. As he began to speak, heads jerked to attention. The young man continued. The church quickly filled until one important local personage, late in arriving, found it necessary to hang in through an open window in order to hear the words.

The church became as quiet as it had ever been during its most devout contemplation as the speech drew to its close. The strong young voice carried out into the fresh spring air saying, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

Only 181 years have passed since an American patriot uttered those words which were meant to be heard by all men and their Supreme Creator. Patrick Henry pledged his life to preserve the sovereignty of his home and the liberty of his countrymen. Some of them who heard the immortal address did lay down their lives because they believed in what had been said. Hundreds of thousands of American men have dedicated their lives—and deaths—to

the principle that peace must never be gained by the price of surrender and bondage, whatever form it may take.

Right now, in this very day, every citizen of our Republic must give, to and for himself, the few moments required to understand the privilege and obligation of individual liberty. The effort need not be great. It is not necessary for every free man to publicly proclaim himself as a patriot, but neither must he ever be ashamed to do so. The one fundamental requirement is the positive knowledge that there is no compromise with the truth. Armed with this belief, the man of the least background can achieve understanding of his duty and birthrights as a citizen of the United States of America. He can do so through the use of simple common sense—a rare commodity in our beloved country today. It is not difficult to recognize that compromise of the precepts as set down by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, is a modification of the truth to the point where it is no longer truth. When truth dies, freedom dies.

What is the truth for Americans? For those who cherish their liberty, it is belief in the words of such men as Patrick Henry who strived under God-granted opportunity to provide us with liberty in the first place. It is the simple acceptance that our heritage of liberty stems directly from the truths of our Constitution and the men who wrote it.

What is compromise for Americans? It is the willingness to believe that the Constitution is a "horse and buggy document." It is the disinterest which leads to the election of men who themselves are compromising the constitutional rights of American citizens through foreign treaties and international agreements. It is the tragic negotiation with a godless government founded on the concept that *any* means justifies the end. Compromise for Americans is also the individual misunderstanding that in our country one can get "something for nothing."

These same individuals are convinced that the United States of America is their debtor and that they need only sit back and wait for the comfort and welfare due them. Certain groups have even been successful in abridging the right of citizens to labor in the manner that they, the citizens, felt best for themselves and their country. The greatest compromise of all is the steady destruction of personal initiative by government subsidization, confiscation rather than taxation, and the continual squander of American funds abroad.

Patrick Henry did not compromise with his country, himself, nor the truth. We cannot now afford to do less. Is false security so dear and federal welfare so sweet as to be exchanged for our personal liberty? Forbid it, Almighty God! We know not what course others may take, but we *must* think and speak and live American truth—or die!

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York State

One of the most useful and effective citizens' groups in the United States is the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York State. It has many very real accomplishments to its credit.

In the fall of 1956, through its activity, a proposal to authorize \$100,000,000 bond issue for "middle class housing" was defeated at the polls by 350,000 votes.

We suggest that any of our members interested write to the Survey at 100 State St., Albany 7, to secure a free copy of their two-page letter of January 3, 1957. It contains good reading.

This Council Letter may be quoted in whole or part, provided due credit is given to the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., and quotation is specified to be from Economic Council Letter 399, January 15, 1957.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., established in 1930, is a non-profit, non-partisan membership corporation organized under New York State law. It publishes the semi-monthly ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER and occasional ECONOMIC COUNCIL PAPERS.

Subscription \$10 a year, \$6 for six months, \$3.50 for three months. Special rate for student or teacher, \$5 a year.

Air Mail Subscription (domestic) \$11.44 a year, Air Mail (foreign) \$15.00 a year.

EXTRA COPIES of this Council Letter 15c each (8 for \$1), \$9 per 100, \$50 per 1,000.

Special prices will be quoted for larger quantities. Please add 3% sales tax for deliveries in Greater New York and 4% shipping charges on quantities of 100 or more.

**National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.
903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.**